



\$~39

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CM(M) 242/2026**

BIPIN CHHABRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prashant Katara & Mr.
Soin Khan, Advs.

versus

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Himanshu Upadhyay &
Ms. Ruby Sharma, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK CHAUDHARY

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

ORDER

% **11.03.2026**

CM APPLs. 6466 & 6467/2026 (Exemptions)

1. Allowed to subject to all just exceptions.
2. Accordingly, the applications stand disposed of.

CM(M) 242/2026

3. The present petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, 1950 seeking setting aside/modification of the Order dated 07.01.2026 passed by the learned Debts Recovery Tribunal-III, Delhi (hereinafter referred to as 'DRT') in SA no.19/2024.

4. The sole grievance of the petitioner is that, though the DRT heard the matter finally on 12.12.2025 and reserved the same for pronouncement of orders on 07.01.2026, however, when the matter was taken up on the said date, it directed the respondent-bank to place



on record the mortgage documents within a period of 15 days and re-listed the matter for pronouncement of orders on 16.02.2026.

5. The respondent-bank failed to deposit the said documents within the time granted. When the matter was taken up on 16.02.2026, it was again adjourned to 26.02.2026 for the purpose of pronouncement of final orders.

6. Today before us, learned counsel for the petitioner has handed over the copy of the order dated 26.02.2026, which reads as under:

“1. This matter is taken up by this Tribunal through Hybrid mode.

2. Matter is listed for pronouncement of final order. But due to link officer of DRT Jaipur and additional charge of the DRT-II Chandigarh, substantial portion of time has been consumed in hearing and the final order could not be prepared.

3. Relist the matter on 18.03.2026 for rehearing on SA.”

7. Now, the matter is listed on 18.03.2026 for re-hearing of the same application i.e. SA no.19/2024.

8. We are surprised that after the matter was heard twice and listed for pronouncement of final orders, merely because the DRT could not prepare the final order, it has listed the matter for re-hearing. The same cannot be a ground for re-hearing of the matter and at best could be a ground for fixing a date for the purpose of pronouncing final order.

9. However, without going into the issue, we direct the DRT-III, Delhi to hear the S.A. no.19/2024 titled ‘**Bipin Chhabra v. Punjab National Bank**’ and dispose of the same finally as expeditiously as



possible, positively within a period of four weeks after receipt of this order.

10. With the aforesaid observations, the present petition stands disposed of.

11. Pending applications, if any, stands disposed of.

VIVEK CHAUDHARY, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

MARCH 11, 2026

pr/kZ/wc